



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,138	07/10/2006	Nicolas Prigent	PF030060	7177
24498 7590 09/29/2011 Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations THOMSON Licensing LLC P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312				
EXAMINER RUBIN, BLAKE J				
ART UNIT 2457		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 09/29/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@technicolor.com
pat.verlangieri@technicolor.com
russell.smith@technicolor.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/552,138

Applicant(s)

PRIGENT ET AL.

Examiner

BLAKE RUBIN

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-803)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to a communications filed August 19, 2011.
2. Claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 5 are currently amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0098840, hereinafter Hanson) in view of Pabla et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064693, hereinafter Pabla).**

5. With respect to claim 1, Hanson discloses a device adapted to belong to a community of networked devices (paragraph [0089], lines 3-14), said device comprising:

a provable identity and/or means for generating and/or obtaining a provable identity (paragraph [0145]);

means adapted to store information about devices of the community having trust relationships with said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6);

means adapted to store information about devices not trusted by said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-06);

means adapted to store information about devices of the community having had trust relationships with said device in the past but now not trusted by said device (paragraph [0218], lines 10-18);

means for synchronizing trust relationships (paragraph [0099], 12-20) with any other device belonging to said community of network devices based on the stored information (paragraph [0099], lines 1-12).

But does not disclose a distributed authentication system

However, Pabla discloses means for synchronizing trust relationships (paragraph [0727], lines 16-21) in a distributed manner with said any other device belonging to said community (paragraph [0084], lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the intermittent connectivity in a mobile computing environment of Hanson with the distributed indexing of identity information in a peer-to-peer network of Pabla. The motivation to combine being to provide a security mechanism for all peers within peer groups to discover, communicate and cooperate with each other while distributing the security load across the network by enabling each peer to authenticate other peers (Pabla: Abstract).

6. With respect to claim 3, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 1, Hanson further discloses the information about devices comprises the provable identity of said devices (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6).

7. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 1, Hanson further discloses said device is furthermore designed to store information comprising proofs received from other devices of the community that said device is trusted by other devices (paragraph [0104]).

8. With respect to claim 5, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 1, Hanson further discloses said synchronizing means comprise means to exchange information with other devices of the community about devices trusted and/or not trusted by other devices in the community (paragraph [0099], 12-20).

9. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 1, Hanson further discloses said devices comprises:

- a first object capable of containing identities of devices trusted (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6)

- a second object capable of containing identities of devices trusted by said device (paragraph [0096], lines 1-6); and

- a third object capable of containing identities of devices distrusted by said device (paragraph [0218], lines 10-18).

10. With respect to claim 7, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 6, Hanson further discloses said device is able to modify the

content of said first object and/or said second object and/or said third object as a function of information exchanged with other devices of the community (paragraph [0103], lines 7-17).

11. With respect to claim 8, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 6, Hanson further discloses said first object and/or said second object and/or said third object are furthermore able to contain cryptographic material (paragraph [0123], lines 8-10).

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hanson and Pabla as applied to claim 6, in view of Fraser et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0131232).

13. With respect to claim 9, the combination of Hanson and Pabla discloses the device according to claim 6, but does not disclose that the first device is able to banish another device of said community if the identity of said device to be banished is contained in said first or second object of said first device.

However, Fraser, in an analogous art, discloses that a registration agent of a community may remove a member from the community (Fraser: paragraph 0066).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hanson and Pabla with the teachings of Fraser. The motivation to combine being to provide a security mechanism for the community by having the capability to remove a member of the community (Fraser: paragraph 0067).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.	Koliczew	Patent No.	6,298,072
b.	Pouyoul et al	Pat. Pub.	2002/0156893
c.	Bartram et al	Pat. Pub.	2004/0054885
d.	Hondo et al	Pat. Pub.	2004/0128544
e.	Ellis	Patent No.	6,484,257

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAKE RUBIN whose telephone number is (571) 270-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

9/15/11

/Rubin Blake/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457